



Sandy City, Utah

10000 Centennial Parkway
Sandy, UT 84070
Phone: 801-568-7256

Meeting Minutes

Planning Commission

Dave Bromley
Cameron Duncan
David Hart
Ron Mortimer
Daniel Schoenfeld
Steven Wrigley
LaNiece Davenport
Craig Kitterman (Alternate)
Jennifer George (Alternate)

Thursday, August 6, 2026

6:15 PM

Council Chambers and Online

Meeting procedures are found at the end of this agenda.

Meeting went into Recess

Meeting reconvened

This Planning Commission meeting will be conducted both in-person, in the Sandy City Council Chambers at City Hall, and via Zoom Webinar. Residents may attend and participate in the meeting either in-person or via the webinar link below. Register in advance for this webinar:

https://us02web.zoom.us/webinar/register/WN_ffXgZtuBT2aTdm4qpzTvLQ

After registering, you will receive a confirmation email containing information about joining the webinar.

You can join the meeting with the following link:

<https://us02web.zoom.us/j/81890858355>

Or join via phone by dialing:

US: 253 215 8782 or 346 248 7799 or 669 900 6833 or 301 715 8592 or 312 626 6799 or 929 436 2866

(for higher quality, dial a number based on your current location)

International numbers available: <https://us02web.zoom.us/j/81890858355>

Webinar ID: 818 9085 8355

Passcode: 903409

SELF GUIDED FIELD TRIP

1. [26-394](#) Map

Attachments: [080626.pdf](#)

4:45 PM EXECUTIVE SESSION**6:15 PM REGULAR SESSION**

Welcome

Pledge of Allegiance

Introductions

Present 7 - Commissioner Craig Kitterman
Commissioner Jennifer George
Commissioner Dave Bromley
Commissioner David Hart
Commissioner Daniel Schoenfeld
Commissioner Ron Mortimer
Commissioner Steven Wrigley

Absent 2 - Commissioner LaNiece Davenport
Commissioner Cameron Duncan

Public Meeting Items

2. [SUB0630202](#) Raddon Summit Subdivision (Preliminary Plat Review)
[6-007236](#) 10250 S. Monroe St.
[Community #9, Commercial Area]

Attachments: [Raddon Summit Sub Staff Report 8-6-26](#)
[Exhibit A](#)

Mike Wilcox, Sandy City Planning Director, introduced this item to the Planning Commission.

Ron Raddon, presented this item to the Planning Commission.

Mike Wilcox further presented this item to the Planning Commission.

Daniel Schoenfeld opened this item for public comment.

Daniel Schoenfeld closed this item to public comment.

A motion was made by Jennifer George, seconded by Dave Bromley, that the Planning Commission determine that preliminary subdivision review is substantially complete for the Raddon Summit Subdivision located at 10250 S Monroe St based on the four findings and subject to the three conditions detailed in the staff report. The motion carried by the following role call vote:

Yes: 7 - Craig Kitterman
Jennifer George
Dave Bromley
David Hart
Daniel Schoenfeld
Ron Mortimer
Steven Wrigley

Absent: 2 - LaNiece Davenport
Cameron Duncan

Nonvoting: 0

Public Hearings

DRAFT

3. [CA07272026](#) Detached Accessory Dwelling Units
[-0007251](#)
[\(PC\)](#)

Attachments: [Maps of Potential Areas for ADUs](#)
[SB0284 applying to ADUs](#)
[Code Amendment D-ADUs - Redline Version](#)
[Code Amendment D-ADUs - Clean Version](#)

Melissa Anderson, Sandy City Zoning Administrator, presented this item to the Planning Commission.

Daniel Schoenfeld opened this item for public comment.

James Longstaff, 2285 E 10095 S, asked the Planning Commission to adopt Wasatch Advocates for Livable Communities (WALC) recommendations.

Steven Van Maren, Draper resident, asked if external ADU's need to be built on a slab and if they'll allow basements.

Daniel Schoenfeld closed this item to public comment.

Melissa Anderson replied to Steven Van Maren's question and said the text does state that it needs to be on a permanent foundation but it does not require a slab on grade foundation and yes, the proposed code does allow for basements.

Steven Wrigley asked if he'd have to build an extended living area or an ADU for his aging parents.

Craig Kitterman asked if extended living area requires a kitchen.

Mike Wilcox said the kitchen is not required.

Dave Bromley referenced Section 21-11-1(d)(3) and asked staff what's the purpose of requiring this from the applicant.

Melissa Anderson said that the requirement is relevant because you would only be allowed to have either one ADU or one extended living area on the lot and being able to look at the project as a whole helps to know what's going on in the primary dwelling.

Dave Bromley said that's what the Affidavit is for and doesn't feel this should be required for every application.

David Hart said that for a detached accessory structure he sees the purpose for the elevations but doesn't see the purpose of requiring a floor plan for the existing unit and agreed with Dave Bromley that the Affidavit makes sense.

Dave Bromley suggested to take a picture of the elevations rather than drawing them up.

David Hart said elevations are necessary.

Craig Kitterman said one reason for requiring the floor plans would be to make sure

smoke/carbon monoxide detectors and the electrical are up to code.

Dave Bromley said the requirement is irrelevant for a detached structure.

Craig Kitterman said but if it's attached there would still need to be some inspection to make sure it meets code.

Dave Bromley said if it's a detached structure you don't need to worry about the primary residence and should not be required during a submission for approval and a picture of the main building should be sufficient.

David Hart said he doesn't feel an elevation needs to be drawn up for the main building if the structure is detached but it is needed for the new building.

Dave Bromley agreed.

Craig Kitterman said that the state may take out the language regarding design and asked if staff is allowed to add language about design.

Melissa Anderson said the sentence that mirrors the state language exactly and if the state amends it, staff will amend it accordingly.

Mike Wilcox said that that's part of the reason staff refrained from providing additional design standards.

David Hart said that it's a challenge to delineate between what's needed and what's design and the discussion of elevation and floor plan needs to happen. He also said the focus should be on the detached building and not on the original structure.

Daniel Schoenfeld asked if they were giving staff an edited version of the code.

Dave Bromley asked Melissa Anderson if she was revising her draft.

Melissa Anderson said they might consider some minor revisions before the next meeting.

Dave Bromley said that he wants the Planning Commission to provide something that hopefully will pass, as a motion, in addition to what staff is proposing.

Melissa Anderson said that in two weeks the Planning Commission can also give direction on what their formal motion will be and staff will make sure to reflect that in the recommendation.

Dave Bromley said that he plans on documenting the reasons for the changes because he wants City Council to understand why the recommendation is coming about.

Ron Mortimer asked staff for clarification on how the item will be presented to City Council.

James Sorensen, Sandy City Planning Director, said that staff always presents to City Council whatever the Planning Commission puts forward.

Mike Wilcox said that staff always reports on the full process of what transpired and gives a full recommendation from both staff and the Planning Commission, to the City Council.

James Sorensen commented that for items that are presented to the Planning Commission before going to City Council, the City Council frequently ask what the Planning Commission recommended.

Mike Wilcox also reminded the commissioners that as Sandy City residents, it is within their right to attend City Council meetings and make public comment.

David Hart asked why he cannot have front door facing the street for an attached ADU as referenced in Section 21-11-1(f)(1)a.

Mike Wilcox said that it's to retain a single family dwelling appearance so it doesn't look like a duplex.

Craig Kitterman said he agrees.

Dave Bromley said that if the house is on a corner lot they should be able to have another door facing the other street. He also said there may be other instances like topography or maybe another very specific issue that they can't foresee that needs a path outward of that and he'd be fine with a Director's approval.

Craig Kitterman said that adding front street or front property line would take care of the corner lot.

Mike Wilcox said that a corner lot has two frontages but the setbacks are different.

David Hart suggested to strike the whole thing.

Dave Bromley suggested that for corner lots you can have a lot fronting both streets and said that he's okay with the Director's approval for instances that have unique circumstances.

David Hart said he disagrees with the front doors looking like a duplex.

Dave Bromley spoke at length regarding the single-family dwelling design under section Section 21-11-1(f)(1)(b) and said that there needs to be a path forward to get this done.

David Hart asked for clarification on the code if it's requiring that all detached ADU's be attached.

Mike Wilcox said it's a section in the attached extended living area and attached ADU design requirements.

Darien Alcorn, Sandy City Attorney, said that if there's a breezeway it could just be designed as detached and not prohibited if designed as a breezeway.

Mike Wilcox said that Dave Bromley's question is for an attached ADU and the method of attachment is through a breezeway and not through the physical sharing of a wall.

Darien Alcorn asked why does it need to be attached if you're already allowed to have a detached.

Dave Bromley said size and height and that you're not going to be subject to the size restrictions.

Craig Kitterman said another good reason is privacy. Whether it's a garage or a breezeway it adds more privacy.

Dave Bromley said to have a habitable area attached is costly and unnecessary.

Steven Wrigley asked what the difference is with building a detached ADU that has to be six feet from the primary dwelling and a detached structure with a breezeway that puts the structure pretty close to six feet.

James Sorensen explained what those differences were.

Dave Bromley said you still need to have a separation between your primary structure with a breezeway attaching.

Steve Wrigley asked if it has to be three or six feet.

Dave Bromley said the code says a minimum of six feet.

Steven Wrigley asked why he wouldn't build a breezeway for all ADU's if it gives more room and said if he puts a breezeway it's now part of his house and he can make it bigger.

Dave Bromley said within ADU ordinances there could possibly be some reduced setbacks that you could get. If attaching to the primary residence you have to keep within the setbacks of your lot.

David Hart said that the 50% connection seems arbitrary.

Dave Bromley said he thinks it needs to go away 100%.

David Hart agreed and asked if the suggested language could say, may be connected to the existing living common area and then change this connection to be what it's going to be.

Dave Bromley said it should allow for breezeways and he doesn't think there should be a minimum linear foot connection and can go into non-habitable areas. He then asked if you have a detached unit, that meets the setbacks, how can you have a porch light that does not spill beyond the property.

Melissa Anderson said the lighting on the detached ADU should not spill over to the neighboring property.

Dave Bromley said limited makes sense but none does not.

Mike Wilcox said that the light cannot spill or go beyond property.

Dave Bromley said the word any is what he has an issue with.

Mike Wilcox said commercial properties are required that their lighting does not spill light onto residential side of the property line.

Dave Bromley said there isn't a way to do this.

Craig Kitterman said this comes up in dark sky concept all the time in new housing where there are fixtures that are rated dark sky, meaning they don't shine out and asked staff if there's a dark sky policy in the code.

Mike Wilcox said there isn't a dark sky policy in the code but they could institute a dark sky compliant light.

Dave Bromley referenced Section 21-11-1(h) and asked staff if there's a reasonable path forward to be able to accomplish this.

Melissa Anderson said if a building is non compliant they would have to go through the building permit process to ensure the structure meets minimum building code stands and make it legal and once it's legal they can move forward.

Mike Wilcox said if there's a legal non conforming structure, anything new beyond the adoption date of this code they need to follow the ADU standards.

David Hart commented if there's an illegal structure built 10 years ago they would need to make it legal.

Dave Bromley said there has to be a pathway to get an un-permitted structure on your property legal.

David Hart said they just have to make it legal.

Mike Wilcox said a lot of the non-conforming, non-legal structures are going to be very expensive to bring into conformance with building code if they were not built with a building permit to begin with but there is a process and staff does work with property owners to help them bring it to legal status.

Melissa Anderson said there may be a way to clarify that this is the process and maybe the wrong terminology was used.

Dave Bromley asked about Section 21-24-8(b) and recommended to provide a reduction of one for parking.

Melissa Anderson suggested no more than one parking space required if within 1/2 mile of a transit station.

Mike Wilcox said that Dave Bromley's proposing a one car reduction if they're within that radii so if the requirement is for one stall they could reduce it by one.

David Hart said he thinks they should at least have one.

Dave Bromley asked if there are structures within the stationary plans that already received a parking reduction and then would also double dip by getting a reduction on this.

Mike Wilcox said that single family homes are not reduced.

David Hart said that what Dave Bromley is referring to is if the ADU requires two parking stalls they can reduce it to one. If they required one parking stall they have to provide one.

Dave Bromley said zero.

Mike Wilcox said that staff's proposal is that the additional parking requirement would be waived if they're within those radii. He explained the rationale behind that is because of their proximity to transit and that staff wants to put most of the housing and encourage ADU's and additional housing around the transit area stations.

Dave Bromley suggested that they do one increase beyond what staff is proposing and allow a reduction of one. So if it's 650 or below, to not have a reduction, and if it's above 650 with two then reduce it to one.

Craig Kitterman said this will allow for on street parking if you don't require any off street parking space which is dangerous.

Mike Wilcox clarified that if there's a home in historic Sandy that wasn't built with a garage or off street parking, in order for them to build an ADU they are required to bring their home into compliance with current code which means a two car garage and a two car driveway is required before they can build an internal or external ADU. He also explained that for an external ADU there has to be one or possibly two depending on the size of the ADU unless you're within the radii of a transit area station. So it's not that there's no off-street parking, they're just not increasing the off street parking beyond the four off-street parking stalls that would be required. He also stated that there are requirements for off street parking its just that they're not requiring additional.

Melissa Anderson asked Dave Bromley if he's asking for no more than one parking space to be required if you're within it.

Dave Bromley said no, if it's larger than 650 but if it's lower than that he's acquiescing. He then talked about the definition codes in Section 21-37-6 "E" and shared his concerns with including the verbiage "or other habitable areas" and that it doesn't make any sense and asked staff if they'd be willing to remove this verbiage.

David Hart described his house and said by definition staff would see this area as an extended living area and that the definition needs some work.

Mike Wilcox explained the reasoning for this definition.

Dave Bromley said he doesn't agree.

Craig Kitterman asked isn't there a limit of two ADU's.

Mike Wilcox said there is a limit of two accessory structures within a non designated "A" zone property, but the proposal would limit one ADU per property (either attached or detached).

David Hart suggested that this could be a scenario where the owner provide an Affidavit to say the extended living area would not be turned into an ADU and the Director then has the discretion to approve.

Dave Bromley gave two suggestions on how he'd like the code to be written.

Daniel Schoenfeld said it should be one and not both.

Dave Bromley said he's recommending adopting one of two of his suggestions.

Jennifer George clarified that there would still be two structures. One being an office and one being an ADU.

Ron Mortimer agreed with Dave Bromley's suggestion as long as they meet the setbacks.

David Hart said it could also be done with the Director's discretion.

Steven Wrigley asked if it still has to be limited to meet the 75% total building footprint of the primary dwelling.

Mike Wilcox said yes.

Steven Wrigley commented that the only time this would be relevant is if you have a really large property.

Dave Bromley asked what S1 means under Sections 21-7-2 & 21-8-2.

Mike Wilcox said it's a Special Use Permit and 1 is a subscript note that references single family developments.

Dave Bromley then asked why is there an S for ADU's (attached or detached) of 11,000 square foot lots.

Mike Wilcox explained the reasoning.

Dave Bromley referenced Section 21-11-1(e)(1) and said he would suggest having an internal ADU and external ADU.

David Hart said he would consider allowing one detached ADU, one extended living area and one attached ADU for a 40,000 square foot lot or larger. He said a 20,000 sq ft lot would also work but would be tight.

Dave Bromley clarified the recommendation would be to allow for one detached and one attached for a 20,000 sq ft lot or larger.

Mike Wilcox clarified if you're under 20,000 sq ft lots you'd be limited to one or the other.

Dave Bromley said yes and that you could also do a conditional use permit for enhanced size up to 25% more.

Mike Wilcox agreed and said that what's being proposed in this ordinance is that those rules, unless otherwise stipulated in this section, are not applicable to ADU's and explained the reasoning for that.

Dave Bromley suggested a separate table be created for ADU's and then for extended living areas.

Melissa Anderson said this may not be feasible.

Mike Wilcox asked to understand that because by doing this it wouldn't count towards the total and confirmed this is for total footprint and not square footage.

Dave Bromley explained his reasoning and confirmed it would be for total footprint and not square footage.

Craig Kitterman asked what rules would apply for a detached ADU.

Mike Wilcox said it would be the proposed language suggested by Dave Bromley.

Melissa Anderson said in terms of size it has to meet multiple requirements. It can't be more than 75% of the footprint of the home and the building footprint of the detached ADU would follow the size limits listed in the accessory standards table which is 25% of the rear yard area or a maximum square footage depending on the size of the lot, whichever is less.

Craig Kitterman said his understanding is that for a 20,000 sq ft could have a 1,500 sq ft ADU.

Melissa Anderson said potentially, yes, if the other standards are met (no larger than 75% of the primary home and no more than 25% of the rear yard).

Mike Wilcox reviewed the table with the commissioners and had a lengthy discussion relating to this.

Dave Bromley referenced Section 21-11-1(g)(8) and asked the commissioners their thoughts about the minimum property size of 11,000 sq ft or larger.

Jennifer George asked staff the reasoning for the size.

Mike Wilcox said the state mandates that the city consider and approve this minimum.

Daniel Schoenfeld asked what would be the criteria where staff would decide to lower it.

James Sorensen said if the Planning Commission recommends to lower it to 10,000 then staff will put that forward to City Council. Overall staff feels if they stick to what the state has mandated and see how that goes.

Jennifer George asked if City Council denies their recommendation, could the code be written to revisit their request after a year.

Melissa Anderson said the Commission can recommend it but not include it in the code language.

Dave Bromley said the minimum should not be set at 11,000 sq ft and recommend at least 10,000 sq ft and asked each commissioner what their minimums would be. He also said the community will lose out if they don't put a better foot forward.

All the Planning Commissioners said they're comfortable with a minimum of 10,000 sq ft.

David Hart said all lot sizes should have this opportunity because those with smaller lot sizes won't have the same opportunities to make additional income compared to those with bigger lot sizes.

Melissa Anderson said those cases could still do an ADU but it would need to be an attached ADU.

David Hart said he feels they're being discriminatory towards those residents who might really benefit from this.

Dave Bromley said this code misses out on creativity of new construction, with regard to location.

Ron Mortimer agreed and said that other communities are building subdivisions with ADU's as part of the house.

Mike Wilcox said he would be comfortable with coming up with a design standard that could address these concerns if they didn't have constraints to design standards.

Dave Bromley then suggested verbiage to use for the code.

Craig Kitterman disagreed and said it should not be in the front of the house and not just the setbacks.

David Hart shared his concern with Dave Bromley's proposal and suggested that some of this can be done at the Director's discretion.

Daniel Schoenfeld said he agrees with how staff has presented the code.

David Hart said if you don't have any room in the back but plenty of room in the front to build, you should be able to appeal to the Director for a waiver and suggested that the code include language to give the Director the ability to override the code in case there is no other alternative or that the alternative is a better building.

Daniel Schoenfeld said this creates a really dangerous precedent without a set criteria in place.

Ron Mortimer and Steven Wrigley both stated this would negatively impact the neighbors and the risk is too high.

Mike Wilcox and Dave Bromley had a lengthy discussion regarding allowing ADU's in the front yard area (in front of the house) and the front building setback standard.

Dave Bromley asked if this code Section 21-11-1(g)(8), with regard to building height and setbacks from side and rear property lines, is offering reduced setbacks.

Melissa Anderson said yes if the structure is no more than 15 feet tall the side and rear setback is proposed to be 10 feet.

Dave Bromley said he's comfortable with the proposal.

A motion was made by Dave Bromley, seconded by David Hart, that the Planning Commission table this decision until the August 20, 2026 meeting. The motion carried by the following roll call vote:

Yes: 7 - Craig Kitterman
Jennifer George
Dave Bromley
David Hart
Daniel Schoenfeld
Ron Mortimer
Steven Wrigley

Absent: 2 - LaNiece Davenport
Cameron Duncan

Nonvoting: 0

Administrative Business

1. Minutes

[26-395](#) Minutes from the July 16, 2026 Meeting

Attachments: [07.16.2026 PC Minutes \(DRAFT\).pdf](#)

An all in favor motion was made by David Hart to approve the meeting minutes from 07.16.2026.

2. Sandy City Development Report

[26-396](#) Development Report

Attachments: [08.01.2026 DEV REPORT.pdf](#)

3. Director's Report

Adjournment

An all in favor motion was made to adjourn.

Meeting Procedure

1. Staff Introduction
2. Developer/Project Applicant presentation
3. Staff Presentation
4. Open Public Comment (if item has been noticed to the public)
5. Close Public Comment
6. Planning Commission Deliberation
7. Planning Commission Motion

In order to be considerate of everyone attending the meeting and to more closely follow the published agenda times, public comments will be limited to 2 minutes per person per item. A spokesperson who has been asked by a group to summarize their concerns will be allowed 5 minutes to speak. Comments which cannot be made within these time limits should be submitted in writing to the Community Development Department prior to noon the day before the scheduled meeting.

Planning Commission applications may be tabled if: 1) Additional information is needed in order to take action on the item; OR 2) The Planning Commission feels there are unresolved issues that may need further attention before the Commission is ready to make a motion. No agenda item will begin after 11 pm without a unanimous vote of the Commission. The Commission may carry over agenda items, scheduled late in the evening and not heard, to the next regular scheduled meeting.

In compliance with the Americans With Disabilities Act, reasonable accommodations for individuals with disabilities will be provided upon request. For assistance, or if you have any questions regarding the Planning Commission Agenda or any of the items, please call the Sandy City Planning Department at (801) 568-7256